

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO**

**CARDELL DOYLE,**

**Case No. 1:21-cv-01838-PAB**

**Petitioner,**

**JUDGE PAMELA A. BARKER**

**-vs-**

**Magistrate Judge Jennifer Dowdell  
Armstrong**

**WARDEN TIM MCCONAHAY,**

**Respondent.**

**MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND  
ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Jennifer Dowdell Armstrong (Doc. No. 10), which recommends denial of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pending before the Court. No objections have been filed.<sup>1</sup> For the following reasons, the Report and Recommendation is ACCEPTED.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

When objections are made to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court reviews the case *de novo*. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3) provides in pertinent part:

The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation was filed on April 3, 2024. (Doc. No. 10.) On April 24, 2024, Petitioner filed an "Allocation Statement," in which Petitioner makes several contentions. (Doc. No. 11.) None of Petitioner's contentions in his Allocation Statement pertain to or discuss the reasoning or conclusions in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, errors in sentencing, or anything else relevant to his conviction. (Doc. No. 11.) Petitioner's Allocation Statement, therefore, does not constitute a proper "objection" to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. *Hill v. Black*, 2023 WL 1430468, at \*2 (N.D. Ohio Feb. 1, 2023) (reviewing report and recommendation for plain error despite petitioner's objection because objection was "not responsive" to the magistrate judge's recommendation and therefore did "not constitute a proper objection entitled to de novo review").

As stated in the Advisory Committee Notes, “[w]hen no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” In *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985), the Court held, “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings.”

### **DECISION**

This Court, having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and finding no clear error, accepts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation. The Court hereby denies the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus for the reasons stated by the Magistrate Judge in the Report and Recommendation, which is incorporated herein by reference. Furthermore, the Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: May 9, 2024

s/Pamela A. Barker  
PAMELA A. BARKER  
U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE